

**REMARKS**

Claims 26-38 and 49-61 were pending in the above-captioned application when the present Office Action was mailed (May 12, 2006). In this response, claims 34-38, 53, 54 and 61 have been cancelled, claims 26, 49 and 55-56 have been amended, and claims 91 and 92 have been added. Accordingly, claims 26-33, 49-52, 55-60, 91 and 92 are currently pending.

In the May 12, 2006 Office Action, all the pending claims were rejected. More specifically, the status of the application in light of this Office Action is as follows:

(A) a terminal disclaimer referenced in a prior Office Action response was indicated not to have been filed;

(B) claims 34-38, 53, 54 and 56-61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,261,426 to Uzoh et al. ("Uzoh");

(C) claim 55 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uzoh in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,126,798 to Reid et al. ("Reid"); and

(D) claims 26-38 and 49-52 stand rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-33 of U.S. Patent No. 6,368,475.

A. Terminal Disclaimer

The undersigned attorney referenced a terminal disclaimer in a response filed in this application on February 16, 2006, but inadvertently neglected to include the terminal disclaimer. An appropriate terminal disclaimer is filed herewith.

B. Response to the Section 102 Rejections

Claims 34-38, 53, 54 and 56-61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Uzoh. Claims 34-38, 53, 54 and 61 have been cancelled and accordingly, the Section 102 rejections of these claims are now moot.

Claims 56-60 have been amended to depend from new claim 91. New claim 91 is directed to a reactor for electrochemically processing a microelectronic workpiece, and includes a fluid vessel and an ion selective membrane positioned in the vessel between a first fluid flow region and a second fluid flow region. A first electrode is in fluid communication with the first fluid flow region and a second electrode is positioned to contact the microelectronic workpiece while it and the microelectronic workpiece are in fluid communication with the second fluid flow region. A first fluid flow entry is positioned to provide a first processing fluid to the first fluid flow region, and a first fluid flow exit is positioned to remove the first processing fluid from the first fluid flow region. A second fluid flow entry is positioned to provide a second processing fluid different than the first processing fluid to the second fluid flow region, and a second fluid flow exit is positioned to remove the second processing fluid from the second fluid flow region. Accordingly, the vessel can carry different processing fluids in corresponding different fluid flow regions, with the ion selective membrane allowing passage of selected ions from one region to another. Support for new claim 91 may be found, *inter alia*, at page 14, lines 1-4 of the present specification, as filed.

Claim 91 is patentable over the applied references for at least the reason that the applied references failed to disclose or suggest two fluid flow regions, each having an entry positioned to provide different processing fluids to the respective fluid flow regions, each having a different fluid flow exit, and each being separated from the other by an ion selective membrane.

As noted above, claims 55-60 have been amended to depend from claim 91. Accordingly, these claims are allowable over the applied references for the reasons discussed above and for the additional features of these dependent claims.

C. Response to the Section 103 Rejection

Claim 55 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uzoh in view of Reid. Claim 55 depends from claim 91, which was discussed above. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons discussed above with reference to claim 91, and for the additional features of claim 55, this claim patentably defines over the applied references.

D. Response to the Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 26-38 and 49-52 were rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting in light of U.S. Patent No. 6,368,475. Of the foregoing claims, claims 26 and 49 have been amended in a non-narrowing fashion to add punctuation consistent with other claims in this application. In light of the enclosed terminal disclaimer, and without commenting on or conceding the merits of this rejection, but rather to expedite prosecution of this application, the double patenting rejection should be withdrawn.

E. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner discovers any informalities or other matters that may be expediently handled by telephone, she is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (206) 359-3257.

Dated: Oct. 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John M. Wechkin

Registration No.: 42,216

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000

(206) 359-7198 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant